REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 4–6, 11–12 and 15 have been amended.

The drawings are objected to. The specification has been amended to add the reference character 5A in the description of the invention as previously mentioned on page 8 of the specification.

Clams 1, 3–9 and 11–15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0147518) in view of Weyer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,671,714), further in view of Pinard et al. (GB 2 306 853). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the references disclose or suggest "an internal data base that has sender data sets associated with sender numbers, wherein each data set includes data fields describing a type and a location of resources" as recited in amended claim 1. Similar language is found in claim 15.

Albal discloses communication devices 52, 58 connected by a transport system 54, which routes calls to a communication node 56, 212 with a subscriber's address book 63 (Fig. 2, paragraphs 23, 73). In Albal, the address book 63 may list a caller's name, address, phone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses (Figs. 2 and 3; paragraphs 25–26).

Although the Albal address book lists contact names, numbers and addresses, Albal does not teach that the address book is included in the communication device. Therefore, Albal fails to disclose or suggest sender data from an internal sender database as in the claimed invention.

Weyer does not overcome the deficiencies of the Albal reference. Weyer discloses an example of a *website* that contains background information about a recipient including an email address (Fig. 9, col. 11, lines 3–37), but this Weyer website is not an internal sender database. Weyer also discloses an interface server 110 connected to a contact database 115 (col. 3, lines 40–42; col. 10, line 13, to col. 12, lines 12). In Weyer, a sender accesses the interface server's web site (col. 4, line 12, to col. 53; Fig. 5) and if the recipient's name is found in the contact database, the sender may visit the recipient's website or send the recipient an email message (Figs. 2–4).

Since the Weyer contact database is for *recipient* contact information, Weyer does not teach a contact database for *sender* contact information. Thus, Weyer does not disclose or suggest sender data from a sender database as in the claimed invention.

Pinard also does not overcome the deficiencies of the Albal and Weyer references. Pinard discloses a method of routing an incoming call to a telephone and sending a file related to the incoming call from a database to a computer associated with the telephone. Therefore, Pinard merely teaches a file related to an incoming call retrieved from a database. Pinard does not disclose or suggest sender data from a sender database. Thus, even if combined, the references do not disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, there is no motivation or suggestion for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combined the Weyer or Pinard with Albal to arrive at the present invention.

Albal discloses communication devices connected by a transport system, which routes calls to a communication node with a subscriber's address book (Fig. 2, paragraphs 23, 73). Weyer discloses an interface server connected to a contact database, but this contact database only has contact information for recipients and is only used for on-line communication (col. 3,

lines 40–42; col. 10, line 13, to col. 12, lines 12). In Weyer, a sender accesses the interface

server's web site to visit the recipient's website or send the recipient an email message (col. 4,

line 12, to col. 53; Fig. 5).

Since the Weyer contact database has only *recipient* contact information and does not

involve incoming calls, there is no motivation or need to use the Weyer contact database

elements to modify the Albal address book, which has *sender* contact information and identifies

a caller. One skilled in the art at the time the invention would not have combined Weyer with

Albal to arrive at the claimed invention.

Pinard discloses a method of routing an incoming call to a telephone and sending a file

related to the incoming call from a database to a computer associated with the telephone. Since

Albal already has an address book listing contact information on callers, there is no motivation

or need to replace the address book in Albal with a file as disclosed in Pinard. One skilled in the

art at the time the invention would not have combined Pinard with Albal to arrive at the claimed

invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based upon the combination of

references is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a

condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone

interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same

to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34226.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: _____

Suzanne B. Gagnon – Reg. No. 48,924

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 6, 2006